DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)
DATE: JANUARY 11, 2005
TIME: 8:30 A.M. TO 12:00 P.M.
LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ROOM 122 YAHARA CONFERENCE ROOM

WEAT Members:
- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Patricia Carlson (DET representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)

DET Infrastructure and Networks:
- Erik Mickelson (DET Infrastructure and Networks)

Shared Information Services:
- Kevin Acker (SIS Technical Lead)

Michelle Eldridge, Phil Schwarz, Allen Poppe, and Bud Borja were absent from the meeting.

Agenda Items
1. Enterprise Update
2. Review SIS TRM Projects and Define Project Scope, Deliverables

Meeting Notes
1. Enterprise Updates

1.1 Enterprise Resource Planning
As part of the biennial budget initiatives regarding the consolidation of administrative services, there is a proposal to implement an ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system within the enterprise. At some point in the near future an ERP Feasibility Report will be released. This report is being completed by Salvaggio, Teal and Associates (STA). The release date of the report is still to be determined.

1.2 Help America Vote Act (HAVA) System Technical Architecture
The technical architecture proposed by Accenture is a .Net Architecture. Copies of the technical architecture will be provided to WEAT members at the next WEAT meeting. Under the current contractual agreements, Deloitte Consulting is project managing the HAVA system implementation and Accenture is responsible for the system design and implementation.

1.3 Architectural Review of the Wisconsin Land Information System
On hold pending input from the Chief Information Officer.

1.4 Project Planning and Outcome Based Performance Measures

DOA executive management has launched an internal initiative focused upon project management and outcome based performance measures. DOA executive management has selected to use the Baldridge Quality Criteria for outcome based performance measures and has had two executive level retreats on this topic. To support these initiatives DOA has been evaluating commercial off the shelf products. Allen Poppe, Betsy Paque and Michelle Eldridge have been involved in the preparation of technical and business requirements for these tools and scheduling on-site demonstration for various tools. The Division of State Facilities is interested in being the division to pilot the selected tools/systems. PlanView (http://www.planview.com/) is one tool that is being evaluated for project and portfolio management and Performance Soft (http://www.performancesoft.com/, formerly PBViews) is a tool that is being evaluated for tracking and reporting on selected performance measures.

1.5 Qualiware Demonstration

Qualiware, the tool that IBM used to build its enterprise architecture site, will be doing a demonstration of their software on Friday 1-14-2005. WEAT members were generally impressed with IBM's enterprise architecture intranet. In particular, the fact that the site is driven by common data on architecture, rather than being a collection of static documents.

1.6 Geek Log

An internal DET meeting has been scheduled to discuss the implementation and pilot of Geek Log (www.geeklog.net) for use by the Directory Working Group and WEAT. An anticipated outcome of this meeting is the approval to implement Geek Log as a pilot the Directory Working Group and WEAT.

1.7 Enterprise Security Officer

DET plans to fill the position of an enterprise security officer. It is not known if a general recruitment or the use of an inter-agency partnership agreement will be used to fill this position.

2. **WEAT Principles**

The WEAT web site has been updated to provide access to the principles in a variety of formats, access paths and search strings. While this is all very useful, the CIO has requested that WEAT condense the principles into a single document, so that greater adoption/communication of the WEAT principles can transpire. This is very important as WEAT would like other technical working groups in the enterprise to use the WEAT principles as they make recommendations to the CIO. Jay Jaeger volunteered to provide a draft of a single page version of the WEAT principles for the next WEAT meeting on 1-25-2005.

3. **Review SIS TRM Projects and Define Project Scope, Deliverables**
   3.1 SIS Updates
   A meeting has been scheduled for 1-13-2005 to discuss the TRM SIS Projects. Attendees at this meeting include: Michelle Eldridge, Kevin Acker, Patricia Carlson, Werner Gade, TLC Domain Co-Chairs, TLC Domain Managers, DET Infrastructure Section Chiefs, and SIS Technical Project Managers. The purpose of this meeting is to review the proposed list of TRM SIS Projects and determine:
   ➢ Where should we form workgroups? Or Which Domain or SIS project should take the lead?
   ➢ How will coordination, communication be handled between SIS, TLC, WEAT and DET Operations?
   ➢ Priorities for the TRM SIS projects, not everything can be highest priority and some projects may require sequencing.
   ➢ Establish due dates and deliverables for each of the TRM SIS projects
   The desired outcome of this meeting is to take before the TLC on 1-21-2005 a recommendation for a prioritized list of TRM SIS projects.

   3.2 Technical Reference Model / SIS Decision points
   The SIS projects have a lot of decisions to make and in a very short period of time. The majority of TRM SIS projects need to be completed by the end of February or March of 2005. Some of these projects have significant implications and require that we critically evaluate alternatives and options. There was

significant discussion regarding the role of WEAT versus the role of SIS technical project managers. In general it was agreed that:

➢ WEAT does not need to oversee every single technical recommendation to ensure that the state's IT principles are being followed in these recommendations.
➢ WEAT is not here, generally, to make technical recommendations unless, specifically requested by the CIO or other entity within the enterprise. The SIS project teams, domains and DET operations should be responsible for technical implementation recommendations.
➢ WEAT is responsible for encouraging that a consistent processes is followed for making technical recommendations, and this process encourage the evaluation of alternatives (an example cited was using the WEAT Recommendation Template).
➢ WEAT needs to capture and document SIS recommendations for incorporation into the Technical Reference Model.
➢ WEAT can help to organize and focus the recommendation making processes for TRM SIS projects.

3.3 Technology Classifications within the TRM
WEAT members discussed "classifications" of technology. It was generally agreed that four technology categories were needed. These are provided below.

Strategic - Technologies that are the current standard for use within the enterprise tested and generally accepted as standard by industry. In terms of versioning and support, strategic technologies will be supported at a current release level and one level below the current release level.

Transitional - Technologies are those that do not conform to Wisconsin's Enterprise Architecture or TRM and are recommended to be phased out of the enterprise. For technologies classified as transitional, no further expansion or upgrade to the technology will happen[1].

Sunset (note at the WEAT meeting we called this "Legacy") - Technologies are technologies that do not conform to Wisconsin's Enterprise Architecture and TRM, and a discontinuation date has been set for the technology to be phased out of the enterprise. Sunset technologies cannot be used beyond the sunset date documented within the architecture[2].

Emerging- Products, standards and technologies classified as emerging technologies represent future candidates for standard acceptance and support. Eventually, some elements of the emerging categories will be promoted to the strategic technology classification. Others in this category will simply drop-off from consideration. Only early adopters will implement these technologies into production environments.[3]

3.4 Retirement of Technologies
There was discussion of strategies to retire either aging or non-strategic technologies within the enterprise. A document from the Corporate Executive board / Infrastructure Executive Council "Emerging Strategies for IT Infrastructure Management -- 2004 Update for CIOs" was used to facilitate and encourage discussion among the members of WEAT. When looking at technology retirement competing interests need to be balanced, these include: the cost to migrate to a new technology (so you can retire your current technology), the need to score risks associated with retirement in a rational way that incorporates the business value at risk, and that risk is not an "absolute" (consensus is that this has been a challenge for security).

The next meeting is Tuesday, January 25, 8:30 to 12:30 in room 122 Yahara Conference Room.

# # #

---

[1]An exception request can be made for extending a sunset technology date based upon a business case and funding strategy.
[2] An exception request can be made for extending a sunset technology date based upon a business case and funding strategy.
[3] A request for the implementation of an emerging technology within a production environment will require a business case and funding strategy.